

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-14 are cancelled in the present application. Claims 15-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 15 and 31 are independent claims. By this response, claims 17 and 28 are amended.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 17 is objected to due to informalities. Applicants have amended this claim per the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the term "said clearing" lacks sufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 28 to correct this issue. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 15, 16, 18-21, and 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,333,247 to Gest (hereafter "Gest"). Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Gest discloses "a system and method for scrolling information displayed to a user of a processing system." (Col. 1, lines 19-21). Gest teaches establishing regions within a virtual scroll box such that clicking a mouse button and moving a cursor in a direction within one of those regions will cause text displayed in the virtual scroll box to scroll in that direction. (Col. 6, lines 48-68). Gest teaches that multiple scrolling directions can be established, and that the

number of directions is limited only by “the angular resolution of mouse movement.” (Col. 8, lines 10-14).

#### Claim 15

Independent claim 15 pertains to a method of translating input motion into movement of a display object, where the movement of the display object is restricted by the use of “leading-in areas.” In a pertinent part, claim 15 requires “altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input.” Even if the regions taught by Gest could be equated to the leading-in areas of the present invention, Gest makes no teaching or suggestion of dynamically re-sizing these regions “in response to continuous motion input.” Gest teaches that multiple scroll direction regions may be established, and that scrolling behavior may change depending on what kind of mouse activity is detected either inside or outside the scroll box when the scrolling feature is active (Col. 8, lines 38-56), but does not disclose the possibility that the scroll regions in the scroll box are reshaped or resized dynamically in response to continuous mouse movement while the scroll box is active. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Gest does not teach or suggest “altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input” as required by independent claim 15.

#### Claims 16, 18-21, and 24-28

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 18-21, and 24-28 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 15.

#### Summary

At least in view of the above, Applicants submit that Gest has defects in its teaching and does not anticipate the invention claimed by Applicants. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection insofar as it pertains to the currently pending claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Gest and McCambridge**

Claims 17, 22, 23, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gest in view of U.S. Patent 5,565,887 to McCambridge (hereafter “McCambridge”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**Claim 31**

Applicants respectfully submit that the deficiencies in the teachings of Gest identified with respect to independent claim 15 are equally present in independent claim 31. Claim 31 also pertains to a method of translating input motion into movement of a display object, where the movement of the display object is restricted by the use of “leading-in areas.” Claim 31 also requires “altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input.”

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Gest does not teach or suggest “altering a shape of the established direction-specific leading-in area in response to continuous motion input” as required by independent claim 31 for the same reasons as set forth in connection with independent claim 15. Applicants further submit that McCambridge is not relied upon, nor can it properly be relied upon, to remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies in Gest.

At least in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that McCambridge does not remedy the defects in the teachings of Gest and that therefore Gest and McCambridge do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of independent claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 17, 22, and 23

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17, 22, and 23 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that McCambridge does not remedy the defects in the teachings of Gest and that therefore Gest, and McCambridge do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of claims 17, 22, and 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Gest and Rekimoto**

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gest in view of McCambridge, but the Examiner refers to Rekimoto (U.S. Publication 2001/0048423A1) in the substance of the rejection. This rejection, insofar as Applicants understand it to mean Gest in view of Rekimoto, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 30 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that Rekimoto does not remedy the defects in the teachings of Gest and that therefore Gest, and Rekimoto do not establish, either alone or in combination (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicants do not admit) a prima facie obviousness of claims 29 and 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Michael Cammarata (Reg. No. 39,491) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution .

Dated: March 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant